

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application in view of the foregoing claim amendments and the following remarks.

The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-12, 14-22, and 24-36 are currently pending.
- Claims 13 and 23 were previously canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein.
- Claims 1-7, 11, 12, 14-21, and 30-36 are amended herein.

Support for the amendments to Claims 1-7, 11, 12, 14-21, and 30-36 is found in the originally-filed specification in at least paragraphs [0020], [0030], and [0050] – [0053]. No new matter is being introduced thereby.

Claims 1, 7, 12, and 22 Comply with § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1, 7, 12, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. Initially, Applicant respectfully notes that the Office intended to reject independent Claim 21 instead of dependent Claim 22. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection, and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance of the present application, Applicant hereby amends Claims 1, 7, 12, and 21 in the manner set forth above.

Independent Claim 1, as amended, recites “and to display elimination of non-selected selectable logon controls...” Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is supported by at least paragraph [0020] of the originally-filed specification. Specifically, paragraph [0020] states that “[t]he transition page(s) 204 can be visually animated to convey the transition 200 to a user” and that “while the user-identifiable indicators corresponding to the selected logon control for User-1 114(1) are continually displayed throughout the transition, the indicators and information corresponding to User-2 114(2) and User-N 114(N) are eliminated from the display” (emphasis added). The specification further states that “[t]he indicators and information corresponding to the selectable logon controls that are not selected can be eliminated from the display utilizing any number of methods and techniques to visually animate the transition 200,” (paragraph [0020]; emphasis added). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 7, 12, and 21 satisfy the written description requirement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claims 1-6, 11, 12, 14-20, and 30-36 Recite Statutory Subject Matter Under § 101

Claims 1-6, 11, 12, 14-20, and 30-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection, and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance of the present application, Applicant hereby amends Claims 1-6, 11, 12, 14-21, and 30-36 in the manner set forth above.

In particular, Applicant hereby amends independent Claims 1 and 12 so that they each recite “[a] computing device, comprising: one or more processors; memory; and a user interface...” Furthermore, Applicant amends Claims 11 and 30-36 to recite “computer readable storage media” (emphasis added). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing claims recite statutory subject matter pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Cited Documents

The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the present Application:

- **Rathbone:** Rathbone, "Windows XP for Dummies", Wiley Publishing, Inc., 2001, pp 1-17.
- **Straub:** Straub et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,905,492
- **Hilbert:** Hilbert et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0088570
- **Grossman:** Grossman et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,564,004
- **Malamud:** Malamud et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561

Claims 1-12, 14-22, and 24-30 are Non-Obvious over Rathbone in view of Straub, Hilbert, Grossman, and Malamud

Claims 1-12, 14-22, and 24-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Rathbone in view of Straub, Hilbert, Grossman, and Malamud. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and further requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection, and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance of the

present application, Applicant hereby amends independent Claims 1, 7, 12, and 21 in the manner set forth above.

Independent Claim 1

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Rathbone, Straub, Hilbert, Grossman, and Malamud neither teaches nor suggests at least the following features recited in independent Claim 1:

a transition from the logon page to the desktop page, the transition configured to display after the selectable logon control has been selected but prior to display of the desktop page, the transition configured to display the user-identifiable indicator corresponding to the selectable logon control uninterrupted throughout the transition and to display elimination of non-selected selectable logon controls, thereby enhancing a computing session by providing seamless continuity when a user logs onto the computing system, the transition further configured to include a user-configurable on-line selectable control enabling the user to designate an on-line status that can be displayed to other users prior to transitioning to the desktop page;

More specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing combination of references does not teach or suggest “the transition further configured to include a user-configurable on-line selectable control enabling the user to designate an on-line status that can be displayed to other users prior to transitioning to the desktop page,” as presently recited in Claim 1 (emphasis added).

The above feature is newly recited in independent Claim 1 and, therefore, amended Claim 1 has not been previously rejected. Applicant further submits that the cited combination of references is silent with respect to the above recitation. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth herein, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 1 is patentable over Rathbone, Straub, Hilbert, Grossman, and Malamud, both singularly and in combination.

Independent Claims 7, 12, and 21

The combination of Rathbone, Straub, Hilbert, Grossman, and Malamud fails to teach or suggest each element of independent Claims 7, 12, and 21 for at least the reasoning presented above with respect to independent Claim 1 to the extent that Claims 1, 7, 12, and 21 recite similar subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 7, 12, and 21 are also patentable over Rathbone, Straub, Hilbert, Grossman, and Malamud, both singularly and in combination, for reasons similar to those set forth above.

Dependent Claims 2-6, 8-11, 14-20, 22, and 24-30

As stated above, independent Claims 1, 7, 12, and 21 are patentable over the combination of Rathbone, Straub, Hilbert, Grossman, and Malamud. Accordingly, dependent Claims 2-6, 8-11, 14-20, 22, and 24-30 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 1, 7, 12, and 21, as well as for the additional features that Claims 2-6, 8-11, 14-20, 22, and 24-30 recite.

Claims 31-36 are Non-Obvious over Rathbone in view of Straub, Hilbert, and Malamud

Claims 31-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Rathbone in view of Straub, Hilbert, and Malamud. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and further requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection, and for the sole purpose

of expediting allowance of the present application, Applicant hereby amends independent Claim 31 in the manner set forth above.

Independent Claim 31

The combination of Rathbone, Straub, Hilbert, and Malamud fails to teach or suggest each element of independent Claim 31 for at least the reasoning presented above with respect to independent Claim 1 to the extent that Claims 1 and 31 recite similar subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 31 is also patentable over Rathbone, Straub, Hilbert, and Malamud, both singularly and in combination, for reasons similar to those set forth above.

Dependent Claims 32-36

As stated above, independent Claim 31 is patentable over the combination of Rathbone, Straub, Hilbert, and Malamud. Accordingly, dependent Claims 32-36 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claim 31, as well as for the additional features that Claims 32-36 recite.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-12, 14-22, and 24-36 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and issuance of a notice of allowance.

The arguments and amendments presented herein were necessitated by the most recent Office Action and could not have been presented previously because the Non-Final Office Action rejected claims based on new prior art references not of record. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Brett J. Schlameus/
Brett J. Schlameus
(brett@leehayes.com; 206-876-6022)
Registration No. 60827

Dated: 2/23/2010

Robert C. Peck
(robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)
Registration No. 56826